

Message

From: LEE, LILY [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D6085A744F9347E6836C54C0E85B97B2-LLEE06]
Sent: 10/30/2014 6:38:05 PM
To: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]; Lane, Jackie [Lane.Jackie@epa.gov]; Harris-Bishop, Rusty [Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov]; Terry, Robert [Terry.Robert@epa.gov]; Skadowski, Suzanne [Skadowski.Suzanne@epa.gov]
Subject: FYI - Navy responses re rad issues: media inquiry
Attachments: Response 09Oct2014.docx

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

-----Original Message-----

From: Macchiarella, Thomas L CIV NAVFACHQ, BRAC PMO [mailto:thomas.macchiarella@navy.mil]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 10:55 AM
To: LEE, LILY
Subject: FW: media inquiry

Hi Lily,

For your situational awareness, below and attached you will find the Navy's recent responses to media requests.

--Thomas.

-----Original Message-----

From: Macchiarella, Thomas L CIV NAVFACHQ, BRAC PMO
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2014 3:30 PM
To: Steenson, Ross@Waterboards
Subject: FW: media inquiry

Hi Ross,
As you requested ...

-----Original Message-----

From: Macchiarella, Thomas L CIV NAVFACHQ, BRAC PMO
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2014 1:29 PM
To: 'Miya, Ryan@DTSC'
Subject: media inquiry

Hi Ryan,

For your situational awareness, attached are the responses that we submitted last week.

=====

Second, we recently answered these questions,

- Q1. Can you please confirm the size and duration of the two new contracts awarded to Tetra Tech?
A1. (1) Parcel C Durable Cover - Awarded 9/11/2014; Amount is \$7,026,563; Duration is 36 months.
(2) Parcel C Phase III Rad Work - Awarded 9/23/2014; Amount is \$584,484; Duration is 18 months.
- Q2. I'd like to request Tetra Tech's most recent "Contractor Report Card."
A2. Contractors' evaluations are not public information.

=====

Also, on August 13 we submitted the following responses:

- Q1: How did the Navy determine that soil samples had been collected from locations different than the ones specified in the final status survey reports?
A1: The Navy reviews field data collected by Navy contractors, including soil sample results. During a routine review of the Navy's contractor data, the Navy determined that some of the soil sample results

were not consistent with the results from previous soil samples collected in the same general area. This prompted the Navy to request further evaluation by the contractor to determine the cause and extent of the data inconsistency.

Q2: Did the Navy take and test soil samples of the correct locations to determine the actual results?

A2: No, the Navy has not conducted any independent verification sampling. Instead, the Navy required the contractor to sample all locations identified as not being properly sampled, with the exception of two trenches that were excavated. To date, the sampling results from these locations have been consistent with results of other soil samples previously collected from the same general areas.

Q3: Is the Navy responsible for identifying mistakes in soil sample results?

A3: In accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, the Navy's contractor is responsible for identifying and correcting any errors associated with their work under the contract. The Navy is ultimately responsible for ensuring all cleanup actions, including sampling at the former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (HPNS) and other Navy cleanup sites are performed in accordance with the requirements under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

Q4: If not the Navy, then who is responsible for identifying discrepancies in soil sampling data?

A4: See response to question 3.

Q5: What is the Navy's response to Tetra Tech's investigation into why the soil sample discrepancy occurred?

A5: The Navy determined that the contractor investigated various possible causes for the soil sample discrepancy and implemented several corrective actions to ensure the incident does not reoccur (i.e., conducting additional field oversight, conducting additional training, and supplementing their internal data review methods). The Navy continues to monitor the contractor's performance to ensure that adequate quality control and data evaluation processes are in place.

Q6: What is the Navy's response to Tetra Tech's explanation for why the soil sample discrepancy occurred?

A6: As the oversight agency responsible for adherence to CERCLA standards, the Navy's response was to implement additional contract oversight standards to ensure actions were in place to prevent future discrepancies.

Q7: Does this event call into question the quality of data provided by Tetra Tech in the past?

A7: Yes, the Navy continues to evaluate all current and historic data collected by the contractor. The Navy is committed to ensuring that all reports contain accurate and defensible data.